



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

June 4, 1998

Mr. Ryan Tredway
Staff Attorney
Texas Department of Insurance
Legal and Compliance Division, MC 110-1A
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR98-1388

Dear Mr. Tredway:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 116048.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for information concerning proposed rental car liability rates. You indicate that the department has released some of this information to the requestor. The information at issue is contained in actuarial workpapers and was derived from documents that Hertz and Avis submitted to the department. Although you make no arguments for withholding this information from disclosure, you raise section 552.305 of the Government Code and state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Hertz and Avis.¹

Since the property and privacy rights of third parties may be implicated by the release of the requested information, this office notified Hertz and Avis about the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances). This office received a response from Hertz.

¹You initially claimed that the information at issue was excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, but you have since withdrawn that claim.

Because Avis did not respond to our notice, we have no basis to conclude that the information in the actuarial workpapers relating to Avis is excepted from disclosure. See Open Records Decision Nos. 639 (1996) at 4 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 (1990) at 5 (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 (1990) at 3. The information relating to Avis must, therefore, be released to the requestor.

Hertz argues that section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts its information from disclosure. Section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). As the department does not raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to the requested information. *Id.* (Gov't Code § 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). The requested information may not be withheld under section 552.104.

Hertz also raises section 552.110 as an exception to disclosure of its information. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of "trade secret" from the Restatement of Torts, section 757, which holds a "trade secret" to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the "trade secrets" branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if

that person establishes a prima facie case for exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) at 5.²

In Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996), this office announced that it would follow the federal courts' interpretation of exemption 4 to the federal Freedom of Information Act when applying the second prong of section 552.110 for commercial and financial information. In *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974), the court concluded that for information to be excepted under exemption 4 to the Freedom of Information Act, disclosure of the requested information must be likely either to (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future, or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained. *National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). A business enterprise cannot succeed in a *National Parks* claim by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. Open Records Decision No. 639 (1996) at 4. To prove substantial competitive harm, the party seeking to prevent disclosure must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure. *Id.*

Hertz has not met its burden under either the trade secret prong or the commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110. Accordingly, we must conclude that the information at issue relating to Hertz must be released.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Karen E. Hattaway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KEH/ch

²The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: "(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982) at 2, 306 (1982) at 2, 255 (1980) at 2.

Ref: ID# 116048

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Birny Birnbaum
Consulting Economist
3304 Gilbert Street
Austin, Texas 78703
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Paul M. Tschirhart
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
The Hertz Corporation
225 Brae Boulevard
Park Ridge, New Jersey 07656-0713
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ed Bertero
Avis World Headquarters
900 Old Country Road
Garden City, New York 11530
(w/o enclosures)